TRANSLATION AND/AS RESEARCH[1]

Harry Aveling
Monash University, Australia
haveling@hotmail.com

Abstract

The paper will consider some possible relationships between literary translation and research, the latter briefly defined as "the curiosity-driven production of new knowledge" (Nowotny xix). Two of these relationships are simple: (1) research as a stage in the preparation for the process of translation, and (2) research about the cultural and historical dimensions of already-existing translations. The third is more complex and controversial. The paper further asks: (3) whether the practice of translation is in itself an act of research. The third question raises further considerations about the different types of knowledge to be found in the university, and how these are evaluated and rewarded.

Keywords

artistic research, discourse community, language, paratext, scholarship

About the Author

Harry Aveling holds an adjunct appointment as a Professor in the School of Languages, Cultures, and Linguistics. He specializes in Indonesian and Malay Literature, and Translation Studies. Prof. Aveling has published widely in translation theory and co-authored the new entry on Southeast Asian Translation Traditions in the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2009) with Teri Yamada. He has translated extensively from Indonesian and Malay, from Vietnamese Francophone writing, and co-translated from Hindi. In 1991, he was awarded the Anugerah Pengembangan Sastera by the Federation of Malay Writing Societies (GAPENA) for his contributions to the international recognition of Malay Literature. Among his major translations are *Secrets Need Words: Indonesian Poetry 1966-1998* (Ohio UP, 2001), which was short listed for the NSW Premier's Translation Award 2003, and *Saint Rosa: Selected Verse of Dorothea Rosa Herliany* (IndonesiaTera, 2005), which won the Khatulistiwa Prize for Poetry (Jakarta) in 2006. Besides his supervisory work at Monash University, he has taught courses in Translation Studies at the University of Indonesia, Jakarta; Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta; University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Ho Chi Minh City; and the Vietnam National University, Hanoi. He was a Distinguished Visiting Professor in the Center for International Studies, Ohio University, for Spring Quarter 2011. Prof. Aveling is a Fellow of the Stockholm Collegium of World Literary History, Stockholm University, representing island Southeast Asia. He was

President of the Australian Association for Literary Translation (AALITRA) from 2005 to 2008, and is currently President of the Malaysia and Singapore Society, a regional subgroup of the Asian Studies Association of Australia.

Translation and Research

In this paper, I would like to examine a range of possible relationships between translation, particularly literary translation, and research. Research is obviously one of the major functions of the university, matched only by teaching, and in many institutions it is assumed that the best teaching is informed by ongoing research. Translation is a less obvious activity but it can have a significant impact on the intellectual community. Many of the theories and assumptions which underpin contemporary teaching and research in the humanities and the social sciences are based on the reading of translations of the works of major thinkers: Plato, Aristotle, Kant, Marx, Foucault and Bourdieu are names that spring readily to mind in this regard. Conversely, the absence of translations may impede the circulation and development of new ideas ("Evaluating Translations as Scholarship").

The English verb "translate" derives, as *Webster's New World College Dictionary* tells us, from the Latin, "*translatus*, transferred; used as a past participle of *transferre*". Hence the first meaning of "translate" is: "To change from one place to another. To change from one position, condition, transfer." Traditionally, this had two possible dimensions: a theological dimension, "to convey to heaven, originally without death", and an ecclesiastical dimension, "to transfer (a bishop) from one see to another; also to move from one place of interment to another."

Webster's second meaning is the one that we are most familiar with, "to put into words of a different language." But the third and fourth definitions indicate that this is not the only possibility: translation may take place between different semiotic systems, "to change into another medium or form (to translate ideas into action)," and as within the same language itself as well, "to put into different words; rephrase or paraphrase in explanation." (We shall ignore the fifth meaning, "to retransmit (a telegraphic message) by means of an automatic machine," as being relatively uncommon today). Roman Jakobson has provided us with three technical terms to distinguish between these different types of translation—"interlingual translation" for "the interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language;" "intersemiotic translation" when the interpretation is performed "by means of nonverbal sign systems" (we may also think of a film based on a novel, a dance based on a play, and so on); and "intralingual translation" when the interpretation relies on "other signs of the same language" (Jakobson 139).

Jakobson defines "interlingual translation" as "*translation proper*." Nevertheless, he argues that the best that the translator can hope for is "equivalence in difference," there being no exact fit across languages between the meanings of words, code-units, or entire messages (139). Some other definitions of translation are more positive. Peter Newmark has suggested that: "[Translation is] a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or a statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language" (7). Newmark sees translation as a "craft" and not, presumably, as a "science" following set rules (hence the extra

dimension of the word "attempt") or an "art" dependent on pure inspiration. But he acknowledges a potential for the establishment of precise equivalence between the two sets of messages—"the same message and/or statement in another language." Webster emphasises "words," Newmark the message contained within those words. Eugene Nida and Charles Taber are also interested in the equivalence of the message conveyed, but for them the naturalness of the language of the translation and the effectiveness of its style are a very important part of the process. They write: "Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, firstly in terms of meaning, and secondly in terms of style" (Nida and Taber 12).

These are definitions that see the source text and the target text as innocent facts within a neutral context. Translation scholars are aware, however, that translations are made in response to a need and that these needs may be varied. Margaret Amman therefore suggests: "We can talk of 'translation' when a source text (of oral or written nature) has, for a particular purpose, been used as the model for the production of a text in the target culture" (qtd. in Hatim 27). A poem may be translated, for example, in order to provide close linguistic data about the original or, on the other hand, to provide a purely aesthetic experience for a reader in a new culture who has no interest in the original poem at all. This functional definition does several things. Firstly, it emphasises the needs of the recipient of the translation, the purpose for which the translation is required, as being determinative of the type of translation that will be produced. This, secondly, reduces the authority of the source text: equivalence is more difficult to define. And therefore, thirdly, the correctness of the translation is defined in its functional efficiency: a target text that meets the purpose for which it has been created is considered "adequate," whether it reproduces all of the intricacies of the original text or not.[2]

Andre Lefevere has called this process "rewriting," rather than translating, and he insists: "rewriters adapt, manipulate the originals they work with to some extent, usually to make them fit in with the dominant, or one of the dominant ideological and poetological currents of their time" ("Translation, Rewriting" 8). The term "manipulate" worries people who want translation to be an innocent and transparent process, in which the target text is subordinate (or "faithful") to the source text in every way. If we take the term "manipulate" to mean "work," "handle skillfully," we can see that physicians manipulate their patients, cooks manipulate their ingredients, and, yes, teachers manipulate their students—all worthy activities, done "shrewdly" but not "unfairly" (Webster's New Dictionary 145).

Definition of the term "research" would seem to be less problematical. Helga Nowotny in her "Foreword" to *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*, a work to which we will have frequent recourse in the latter part of this paper, provides a very brief definition: "the curiosity-driven production of new knowledge" (xix). Jenny Williams and Andrew Chesterman in, *The Map: A Beginners Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*, come to the same position: "We define research

broadly as a 'systematic investigation towards increasing the sum of knowledge'" (*Chambers Concise Dictionary* 845). And they continue: "We agree with Gilham (2000a: 2) that 'research is about creating new knowledge, whatever the disciplines'" (Williams and Chesterman 1). More comprehensively, the Australian Research Council defines "research" as: "the creation of new knowledge and/or the use of existing knowledge in a new and creative way so as to generate new concepts, methodologies and understandings. This could include synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative" (12).

Research as a Preparation for Translation

Translators are, of course, concerned with more than just the issue of language, especially when they translate works of literature. Significantly, Andre Lefevere has argued that there are, in fact, four dimensions that need to be taken into consideration in making a translation. As he has written:

> Texts are not written in a vacuum. Like language, literature pre-exists its practitioners. Writers are born into a certain culture at a certain time. They inherit that culture's *language*, its literary traditions (its *poetics*), its material and conceptual characteristics (microwaves and the ideas of Freud in twentieth century American culture; chamber-pots and the ideas of the Enlightenment in eighteenth century England)—in a word its *universe of discourse*—and its *standards*." ("Translating Literature" 86, emphasis added)

Let us take these terms one by one. Another synonym for the "universe of discourse" is "culture." An early and still very useful definition of culture is that provided by Edward B. Tylor in his book *Primitive Culture*: "culture is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society" (qtd. in Schusky and Culbert 5). Culture, as Tylor points out, is complex, whole, material and non-material, and it is learned.

"Standards" might be paraphrased as "ideology." Peter Simpson in his *Language, Ideology and Point of View* (1993) draws our attention to both the neutral and the political aspects of ideology, and to the role of language in their maintenance. He writes:

> An ideology . . . derives from the taken-for-granted assumptions, beliefs and value-systems which are shared collectively by social groups. And when an ideology is the ideology of a particularly powerful social group, it is said to be dominant. Thus, dominant ideologies are mediated through powerful political and social institutions like the government, the law and the medical profession. Our perception of these institutions, moreover, will be shaped

> in part by the specific linguistic practices of the social groups who comprise them. (Simpson 5)

Finally, the term "poetics." Lefevere argues that:

> A poetics can be said to consist of two components: one is an inventory of literary devices, genres, motifs, prototypical characters and situations, and symbols; the other is a concept of what the role of literature is, or should be, in the social system as a whole. ("Translation, Rewriting" 26)

The idea has broader implications as well for thinking about texts that are not literary texts and the term "genre" might be more appropriate.[3]

Arguably, the translator needs to be well informed about each of these levels if s/he is to produce a reasonably adequate translation. Some of these levels carry more weight than others. Lefevere goes on to suggest that, in descending order of importance, they can be ranked from (1) ideology, (2) poetics, (3) universe of discourse, through to, finally, (4) language ("Translating Literature" 87). Or, as he has strikingly written elsewhere: "Language is not the problem. Ideology and politics are . . . " ("Geneaology in the West" 26).

The work that the translator needs to do, in order to find the answer s/he does not know in any of these areas, is a straightforward and basic form of research, which is included, in the first instance, within the words of the resulting translation itself. Depending on the circumstances of publication, it may also be included in a more visible way as "paratext" (Genette), i.e., as the subject matter of introductions, paraphrases, footnotes, and, in the academy, as part of an annotated translation (see Appendix 1), that can surround the text.

Research about Translation

The scholarly discipline that devotes itself to the study of translations is today known as "Translation Studies." The website of the American Literary Translators Association provides us with an inclusive definition of the discipline: "Translation Studies is a formal branch of academic study that addresses critical, creative and research issues involved in the linguistic and interpretive transferral of sense and sound from one language to another and from one cultural context to another." The definition insists: "Translation Studies explores all dimensions of the translation process" ("Translation and Academic Promotion").

The discipline is one of the "new humanities" that came into being in the 1970s—along with media studies, cultural studies, postcolonial studies, gender studies and so on, all areas of previously disdained knowledge. The term is generally attributed to James Holmes in his 1972 essay "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." On the "nature" of the discipline, Holmes insisted in this essay, "as no one I suppose

would deny," that Translation Studies was "an empirical discipline" and also "a field of pure research – that is to say, research pursued for its own sake, quite apart from any direct practical application outside its own terrain" (184). Being an empirical discipline, Holmes believed that "translation studies thus has two main objectives: (1) to describe the phenomena of translating and translation(s) as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience, and (2) to establish general principles by means of which these phenomena can be explained and predicted" (184). These two steps led him to delineate the related fields of Descriptive Translation Studies and Translation Theory.[4]

Holmes divided Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) into three areas of separate focus:

1. Product-oriented DTS is "that area of research which describes existing translations" (184).
2. Function-oriented DTS involves the description of the function of translations in the recipient socio-cultural situation, "it is a study of contexts rather than texts" (185).
3. Process-oriented DTS studies "the problem of what exactly takes place in the 'little black box' of the translator's 'mind' as he creates a new, more or less matching text in another language. . . ." (185)

He argued that Translation Theory (TT) is of two types. The most ambitious is general translation theory, which aims "to develop a full, inclusive theory accommodating so many elements that it can serve to explain and predict all phenomena falling within the terrain of translating and translation, to the exclusion of all phenomena falling outside it" (186). Not surprisingly perhaps, there are not many general translation theories. Two possible candidates are these: translations are commonly longer than their source texts, translations are easier to understand than their source texts.

Partial translation theories are limited by the data of their particular area of study. They can be divided into the following types:

1. Medium restricted translation theories, based on the medium used for translation—human beings (speaking or writing), machines;
2. Area restricted translation theories, focused on specific languages, and cultures;
3. Rank restricted translation theories, from the word, word group, sentence, to the whole text;
4. Text-type restricted translation theories that deal with "specific types or genres of lingual message," such as poetry or scientific articles;
5. Time-restricted theories that draw their conclusions from contemporary texts, or from an older period;

6. Problem-restricted theories: one or more specific problems within the entire area of general translation theory: e.g., the limits of variance and invariance in translation, the nature of equivalence, the translation of metaphors or of proper names. (186-8)

Obviously a great deal could be said about each of these fields (and more fields might also be proposed, this is not a final list), but I shall not do so here[5]. Suffice it to say here that they are each clearly areas of "research," in the sense of being sites for the production of new theoretical knowledge based on a description of objective facts to do with the translation and translating of texts.

Translation Itself as an Act of Research

We have seen two possible relationships between translation and research so far: research as a preparation for the process of translation, and research about existing translations and the processes involved in producing translations. I would now like to ask a more difficult question: Can the act of translation of the whole text be regarded as an act of research, a way of directly producing new knowledge? More broadly, can artistic practice be a form of "research through performance" (Kershaw), assuming that translation is a form of artistic practice? [6]

For some scholars and practitioners, and in some countries, these questions will make no sense. There is "research" and there is "creative work"; both deserve an honoured place in society in general, and in the university in particular. They are separate and different; whether they can be said to be equivalent is not a meaningful issue. Ateneo de Manila University's School of Humanities' webpage entitled "Research and Creative Work in the School of Humanities," for example, begins:

> Owing to the interplay of the critical and the creative that characterizes the nature of the humanities and its various disciplines, the School of Humanities is not limited to the production of new knowledge via research work and publication of academic essays and books. It is also actively engaged in the production of creative or artistic works, such as poems, short stories, novels, films, as well as theatrical plays, stage designs, and art installations.

The distinction between the two activities could not be made more plainly. On the one hand, the School "prides itself for being home to Jesuit mentors whose works and dispositions have remained pivotal points for scholarly endeavors," and who "have inspired the success of alumni scholars" [the names of several distinguished alumni scholars are then listed] and contemporary "noted scholars" [also named] who work in such areas as "national and popular cultures, Philippine literature, colonial studies, political philosophy, interreligious dialogue, ethical perspectives

on environmental issues, world englishes, English language education, and Filipino cultural heritage." On the other hand, "In the field of artistic production," the page continues, "the School of Humanities has been profoundly enriched by the presence and works of the late National Artist for Theater Design, Professor Salvador F. Bernal, whose lasting influence continues to inform the works of theatre directors [the names of several distinguished directors are then listed]. The long-standing humanistic tradition of the Ateneo is also seen in the acclaim garnered by national award-winning creative writers [the names of several distinguished poets and fictionist/essayists are also listed]".

I mention Professor Bernal's name in particular (and ask the forgiveness of those persons whose names I have not mentioned, scholars and creative practitioners alike) because he seems to me to be an example of a creative artist whose practice has created new knowledge that has been passed on to his successors. Here, the questions of whether creative work can be regarded as an act of research, a way of producing new knowledge for the use of others, whether artistic practice can be a form of "research through performance," can be answered in the affirmative, although this was not the intention of the person who wrote the webpage.

In Europe, Australia, and America, the questions take on a greater urgency, as universities increasingly grapple with how best to fit creative work into their long established, and perhaps less flexible, intellectual, and administrative frameworks, where research is a uniquely important and highly rewarded core value. This applies especially to the newly amalgamated schools of fine arts, but also concerns schools of music, creative writing and translation studies programs. A measurable research output relates to such matters as the granting of doctoral degrees, the conferral of higher statuses for the faculty and its members, and greater financial rewards for the individual and their administrative unit. The new trend in the United States is expressed in the title of James Elkins's book, *Artists with PhDs: On the new Doctoral Degree in Studio Art)* which argues that within a short time PhDs "will become the baseline requirement for a competitive job teaching studio art" (vii), and thus presumably in other areas of creative practice as well.[7]

There have, therefore, been several tentative attempts to argue that creative work is in itself a form of research. Paradoxically, the first of these in translation studies also comes from James Holmes. Holmes devised the term "metaliterature" to refer to "writing which makes use of language to communicate something about literature itself" (10). He argued that, while the critic interpreted by writing an analysis of the literary work, the metapoem "interprets by enactment" (11); it creates a new and parallel text which derives its meaning through its separateness from, and relationship to, the original data. The intellectual demands created by such a process are very high:

> It is these three factors—acumen as a critic, craftmanship as a poet, and skill in the analyzing and resolving of a confrontation of norms and conventions

> across linguistic and cultural barriers in the making of appropriate decisions—that determine the degree to which the metapoet is capable of creating a new verbal object which, for all its differences from the original poem at every specific point, is nevertheless similar to it as an overall structure. (11)

The American Literary Translators Association would seem to agree with Holmes. Their website insists that translation is "an exacting art that demands creative expression, philological precision, minute knowledge of historical and cultural contexts, and a nuanced sense of style both in the source and target languages" ("Translation and Academic Promotion"). The literary translation, that is, offers new knowledge about the existing fact of the source text, based on extensive intellectual and artistic skills.

Perhaps, in these situations, artistic work simply exists outside of, or even "beyond," old paradigms of research and new knowledge (Elkins 111-133). Literary translation might be a different type of research altogether from what is sometimes known as "traditional research." It is "artistic research," defined by Soren Kjorup as "the production, use and dissemination of knowledge and insights connected to creative work in art and design" (41). The non-traditional new knowledge produced by this research may be more than intellectual knowledge. It is worth quoting the American author Tim O'Brien on this:

> A fine story . . . brings a human immediacy and human meaning to statistics and dates and events. Stories heal. Stories console. Stories inspire. Stories encourage and embolden. Stories offer us access to the human consequences of global events. Stories elevate our dreams. Stories connect us both to the lives of others and to our own lives. Stories remind us that we are part of something mysterious and universal—that journey down the birth canal and out into the light and thence toward the grave. Stories give a face to suffering and to joy, to moral struggle and sometimes even moral victory. (O'Brien 9)

The arts add knowledge gained through the senses and the emotions to that provided by the mind to provide new knowledge about ourselves, society, and the world in which we live. In the present context of this seminar here in Ateneo de Manila University, we may call this new knowledge a form of spiritual knowledge.

Literary translations raise many further questions about the nature of "knowledge" and of "new knowledge." Having translations of Plato, Aristotle, Kant, Marx, Foucault and Bourdieu available has significantly changed the types of knowledge available for scholarship in English. Perhaps so too does having translations of Dante, Goethe, Tolstoy, Pramoedya Ananta Toer and Jose Rizal? How is spiritual knowledge a form of knowledge? And in what way is knowledge "new" if it already exists in the source culture? Further, if scholarly and literary translations are shaped by language, ideology, genre and culture, as Lefevere insists, and translations are

made in response to the needs of the receiving society, as Amman and Vermeer insist, what effects will this have on the "newness" of the knowledge provided by translators? (Simple examples of such cross-cultural transformations are the different use made of French feminism in America and of the short stories and poetry of Edgar Allan Poe in France.) Does the new knowledge exist in its source language? Or is it only there in the target text? Does it exist beyond language—in every language and no language at all? We have just begun to realize some of the epistemological problems raised by the apparently simple practice of substituting words in one language for those in another.

Nevertheless, scholars outside the academic community of creative arts practitioners everywhere still have great difficulty with the proposition that arts-based research is a form of "research" that may produce new knowledge, as many arts practitioners are now beginning to insist. The case against practice-based research is common. This is, it has been argued, partly because traditional academic scholars often have a rigid concept of what research is—it is something like scientific research, "the building up of true descriptions and rational explanations, mostly in propositional form, for how things work in our physical, social and cultural worlds" (Johnson 141). These propositions are attained through various "methods of theoretical inquiry, forms of experimentation, empirical testing, and confirmation or disconfirmation of hypotheses in pursuit of progressively increasing bodies of objective knowledge" (141). The arts are about emotions, not knowledge, and "don't seem to be in the proposition-stating business" (142). However, we can see that these arguments are flawed when we consider the different types of research that are actually conducted in the humanities and the social sciences today—especially qualitative research, where no hypotheses are proposed, no experiments conducted, nothing measured, and no generalisations produced for future testing in other situations. The same is true of literary and historical studies. Further, postmodern theory has placed the absolute nature of all propositional knowledge under considerable doubt.

If we apply a "discourse community" perspective to this conflict of arguments for and against the arts as recognizable forms of knowledge, then we can also see that the communities of scholars and creative artists are speaking past each other, from the basis of different "values, conventions, meaningful actions and significant activities." As Biggs and Büchler note:

> In particular, the academic community is dissatisfied that its value of accumulation is not supported by the creative practice conventions of using non-linguistic communication to encourage the subjective experiences resulting from direct encounter with the artefact. As a result, the academic research community is dissatisfied that certain actions, such as performing or exhibiting, are not the ones that are meaningful towards their value of the accumulation of knowledge. On the other hand, the creative practice

> community is dissatisfied that its value of 'the singularity of the event' is not addressed in the academic convention of argument-building because the latter emphasises the general rather than the particular. The creative community is dissatisfied with actions such as publishing and archiving because these create problems for the direct encounter with the artefact. Ultimately, the academic community's interest in producing single transferable outcomes is contrary to the creation of diverse personal experiences. (95-6)

This too is not an innocent argument. As I have suggested above, what is ultimately at stake in many cases is power and status. To quote Biggs and Karlsson: "the present position of the arts and the strategies for justifying or describing its benefits reflect the balance of power between the established university and the entering field of arts research" (31). The humanities and social sciences claim the right to set the standards and to distribute the prizes of academic position and financial rewards. In many American institutions, as a consequence, the MFA is considered "a terminal degree" (like a terminal illness?), it produces works of art not works of scholarship, and its graduates are not accredited to teach courses of literary analysis. Creative writing teachers in search of respect are then forced, reasonably enough, to seek refuge in their outsider, bohemian, status; they are not "real academics" but something more, or less, they are "creative writers," "artists" in the Romantic tradition.

2 Translation and Scholarship: Writing a Paratext

Where this tension is felt to be a genuine problem, there is a compromise that is often recommended to ensure that the elements of research involved are clear to those whose duty it is to assess the scholarship of the creative work. This requires the writing of a "paratext," an explanation about the whole artefact, as a bridge to identifying and explaining the research component contained in it. There are rather more ways of "writing about" creative work than one might at first expect, and these can shift from materials immediately surrounding the text to materials circulating beyond the artefact "in a virtually limitless physical and social space" (Genette 344). Genette provides the terms 'peri-text" and "epi-text" for these subcategories of the paratext (344).

At the beginning of an academic career, the peri-text (known variously as an "essay," an "introduction" or an "exegesis") may be an important degree component. The thesis for the MA in Creative Writing of the University of the Philippines, for example, consists of "a publishable book-length creative work accompanied by an introductory essay". The De La Salle University MFA, which includes a possible unit in literary translation, requires: "The writing of imaginative literature of substantial length, along with an essay describing the creative process." The PhD in Creative Writing at the University of the Philippines carries an additional

academic requirement and states how this is to be done: the degree "provides students with the space and guidance to pursue their creative work and make a scholarly contribution to the field of creative writing in the Philippines … The PhD dissertation is a publishable book-length creative work accompanied by a scholarly essay on the art and craft of writing." Similarly, the 2002 *Humanities and Social Sciences Handbook* of the University of Technology, Sydney, informed prospective candidates that: "The work produced for the DCA [Doctor of Creative Arts] is of equivalent intellectual scope and level as a PhD, but is offered in non-traditional forms," then added: "The substantial creative work is accompanied by a 30,000 word dissertation" (115).[8]

The broader epi-text can be important for established (or hoping to be established) faculty members seeking a first or later appointment, tenure, promotion, a merit increase, or simply facing peer review for any other purpose. The nature of the epi-text may further vary according to the location of those powerful peers.

The assessment process may be impersonal and highly regulated, with the unknown peers located at some considerable distance from the faculty member. The Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) initiative of the Australian Research Council, was established as the Commonwealth government's means of collecting data on research conducted in Australian universities. For 2012, its formal requirements are that:

> For non-traditional research outputs which are nominated for ERA peer review, a statement identifying the research component of the output must be provided as part of the submission of an institution. The statement must be no more than 2000 characters (around 250 words) and address the following categories:
>
> 1. Research Background
>   - Field
>   - Context
>   - Research Question
> 2. Research Contribution
>   - Innovation
>   - New Knowledge
> 3. Research Significance
>   - Evidence of Excellence.

An example is given of an acceptable visual arts research statement (see Appendix 2); in 2012 for the first time, "scholarly translations" were accepted as "Original Creative Works" providing they meet the overall submission requirements (Australian Research Council 46-48, Appendix C).

More often, the assessors may be closer at hand, and the process more personal and diverse. The webpage of the (American) Modern Language Association (MLA)

on "Evaluating Translations as Scholarship: Guidelines for Peer Review" includes these "Guidelines for the Candidate":

> A candidate presenting a translation for peer review will take responsibility for documenting and illuminating the creative, critical, and scholarly work involved in the project. In addition to relevant material that may already be available (readers' reports, published commentary, reviews, interviews, conference presentations, and so on), the candidate will prepare a statement providing background information about the author and the work and addressing the following considerations, among others:
> - the importance of the source text as a work of literature or scholarship or as a cultural document, and its potential impact
> - any useful information about the publisher or the series in which the translation appears, along with information about the publisher's review process and any special requirements imposed by the publisher
> - any differences between the source-language audience and the target-language audience that call for adjustments or adaptations
> - any theoretical considerations that influenced the translator's overall strategy
> - any special challenges posed by the form, style, or content of the source-language text, along with examples and explanations of the solutions adopted in the translation process.

The page recommends that where the panel of review does not include a person familiar with the Source Language of the translated text(s), it should seek out the advice of such a person.

In some circumstances, the epi-text may further include some elements that are not the work of the original writer or the translator at all. The webpage of the American Literary Translators Association (ALTA) on "Translation and Academic Promotion and Tenure" suggests:

> A. For a translator to earn promotion and tenure in the academy, translations produced and published should be supplemented by a portfolio of critical materials that may include essays, interviews, reviews, and conference presentations. Critical material generated by translation may include essays on the author translated, the cross-cultural dimensions of the project, a record of the translation process, the technical linguistic challenges and solutions, etc. In building a case for promotion or tenure, it is the translator's obligation to document and explain the multiple interpretive, creative, critical, and scholarly tasks involved in completing the project. Read back issues of *Translation Review* for project ideas.

B. Use respected translators as referees to help you reinforce your credentials as translator/writer/scholar.
C. Consult with ALTA members and the staff of Translation Studies programs to determine what strategies and models for presenting the translator's case have been successful in the past.
D. Tenure and promotion to a senior rank imply leadership in the field. Address specifically the extent to which your work in translation has made a significant or influential contribution. Comments (solicited or not) from publishers, reviewers, and colleagues can be helpful in this regard. Indications of leadership could include national or international exposure of your work, positive critical reviews, commissions, rates of acceptance, publishers', and editors' endorsements, "firsts," and invited readings or lectures.

Clearly, this approach to the assessment of creative work suggests that although the artefact cannot in itself be immediately considered a work of research, writing about the artefact can provide evidence of the scholarship and of the creation of the new knowledge that it contains. Writing reveals what is otherwise only implicit in the work. If the subaltern cannot speak (to borrow a famous phrase), her silence is eloquent and may be represented in many different ways, by many different voices. Peri-texts, epi-texts, and intertextual materials, in general "the documenting, charting, formulating or even fictionalizing of the research enquiry," all of this "can convince us"—and hopefully our teachers, examiners and critical peers!—"that we have gained new insights and understandings and the potential to be critically active in our own contexts" (Macleod and Holdridge 367), that we are indeed scholar-practitioners worthy of the university.

Is "writing about" a satisfactory compromise or does it continue to impose the values and practices of the academic community on the artistic community within its doors? Many creative artists would rather "paint about," "film about," or simply "write" than spend lengthy periods of time explaining what they have already done to those who cannot see their achievements. (The other written interactions—job applications, promotion materials, etc.—are, of course, less avoidable). I suspect that in many cases the demand for "writing about" is unnecessary and restrictive. It is not required in other academic disciplines. Those historians who locate their work within the soft "humanities," for example, have long been content to write the final product and present that as their "research," while leaving behind the sketches and plans, drafts, exclusions, disciplinary and personal reflections, safely hidden in the obscurity of the study. Despite the difficulty of finding the necessary words to describe one's experience, Macleod and Holdridge, following Shottenkirk, are confident that the present new situation will, in the long run, in time become its own justification. They write: "we need not worry overly about the concept of new knowledge; by taking artist researchers on [in the universities], we have done so

on the understanding that they will provide new knowledge, however, whether we accept that they have given us new knowledge or insight into our worlds (institutional or otherwise), remains subject to the politics of our environments and possibly whether we have been able to retain open minds" (367). This is at once too simple and too optimistic an answer, but it marks a hope for reconciliation.

As scholar-practitioners, the habit of "writing about," and indeed "talking about," the fruits of our vocation, will be and must be ongoing, and not merely occur at certain points of crisis in a translator's career. This may be a useful place at which to stop my presentation and to start our discussion, in the search of new knowledge, with "open minds."

Appendix 1: An Annotated Translation

By agreement with a supervisor, a dissertation may be an annotated translation. This should not be confused with a translation with "a lot of footnotes": in usual practice, footnotes are best avoided. However, in an annotated translation, they are used to explain the choices made by the translator. Obviously, therefore, they should NOT be used sparingly in this case, as the absence of a note might be taken as indicating that a difficulty or obscurity had not been properly understood.

An annotated translation should have a brief introduction presenting the text, indicating its interest, and explaining what kinds of difficulties it might present. Getting this introduction "just right" is important: almost any author of interest will have some pages devoted to him/her by standard reference works, and clearly, little credit will be given for a lengthy transcription of widely available material. On the other hand, where the source text is in any way uncertain, an explanation should be provided of which text has been used, or how it was determined. This applies particularly to older texts, but not exclusively so.

The introduction might well address the problem of what a translation is, dealing with some theoretical points, and suggesting particular problems inherent in translating between the two languages concerned, or dealing with the text type.

In the main body of the translation, the source text and the translation should appear on facing pages, with notes at the bottom of the page. It seems likely that majority of the notes will be on the translation side. However, the original text may be annotated also, especially with regard to grammatical difficulties or ambiguities. In general, footnotes should be preferred to end-notes.

Where the text has already been translated, especially if it has been translated more than once, the notes may also provide examples of the other versions, with criticism. It is entirely appropriate to refer to theory in footnotes, where this provides a clue to the justification of a certain approach.

In the calculation of the length of an annotated translation, all the material should be included, EXCEPT the source text. More practically, the source text may be scanned, but you are warned to check any scanned material very thoroughly, as the process is not completely reliable." ("MPhil in Literary Translation—Annotated Translation")

Appendix 2: A Sample ERA Research Statement

The following is an example of an acceptable visual arts research statement:

Research Background

Current international developments in painting have identified the need to establish complex forms for representing identity in terms of facial expression. While this research recognises the significance of facial expression, it has overlooked the unstable nature of identity itself.

Research Contribution

The paintings Multiple Perspectives by Y address the question of the unstable nature of identity as expressed in painterly terms through a study in unstable facial phenomenon using the philosophical concept of 'becoming'. In so doing it arrives at a new benchmark for the discipline in understanding visual identity, namely that identity is not bound to stable facial phenomena but, like other forms of meaning is constantly undergoing change.

Research Significance

The significance of this research is that it overcomes barriers for visually understanding the complex nature of identity and its expressive painterly possibilities. Its value is attested to by the following indicators: selection of the painting for inclusion in the international exhibition Documenta, Kassel, Germany; its inclusion as a case study in the renowned Courtauld Institute, University of London, *Issues in Contemporary Art* graduate seminar series; its being the subject of a chapter in the book *Identity Reframed* published by Thames and Hudson and authored by the renowned art historian Z; its forming part of a competitively funded ARC project.

From Appendix C of ERA 2012 *Submission Guidelines* (Australian Research Council 75).

Notes

1. This paper was prepared for presentation as a keynote address to the conference, "Travelling Texts: Translation and Globalisation," Ateneo de Manila University, 10-12 August 2012, postponed to 31 August 2012 because of the flooding of Manila. Travel support was provided by the School of Languages, Cultures and Linguistics, Monash University. My thanks to Professor Maria Luisa F. Torres for inviting me to speak at the conference and for arranging on-campus accommodation. Thanks too to Dr. Manneke Budiman, Department of Literature, University of Indonesia, for assistance in finding an elusive reference.
2. For a concise statement of this theoretical viewpoint, see Hans J. Vermeer's *Skopos and Commission in Translational Action*.
3. See John Swales's *Genre Analysis*.
4. Holmes also delineated a third area, Applied Translation Studies, which he considered to be, "in Bacon's words, 'of use' rather than 'of light'" (181). Applied TS includes translator training, lexicographical aids and grammars, translation policy, and translation criticism. See also Toury's *Descriptive Translation Studies and beyond* (7-19) and Munday's *Introducing Translation Studies* (15-22).
5. See Basil Hatim's *Teaching and Researching Translation*, and Jenny Williams and Andrew Chesterman's T*he Map: A Beginners Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies*.
6. I am obviously assuming here that translation is a creative art – or possibly a performance art, like acting or playing music from the basis of a predetermined script (at the very least a skilled "craft," to use Peter Newmark's term), using given materials in an individual creative way to produce a new aesthetic object. The term "transcreation," developed by P. Lal of the Writers Workshop, is one to which I am sympathetic. On translation in relation to creative writing, see Perteghella and Loffredo 2006.
7. See also Barrett and Bolt, Leavy, and Smith and Dean for discussion of the British and European situation with regard to the newly emerging doctorate in the creative arts.
8. The 2012 *Handbook* is even more word-focused: "The work produced for this degree is of equivalent intellectual scope and level to a PhD, but is presented in non-traditional formats. Coursework subjects may be prescribed according to individual student requirements. The substantial creative work should be the equivalent of a 50,000–70,000-word written work, accompanied by a 30,000-word dissertation" (UTS, *UTS Handbook 2012, Communication*). How this equivalence is to be established is not explained, nor is its relevance to non-literary fields – "film, video, radio, sound" (UTS, *Humanities and Social Sciences Handbook* 115), "screened, exhibited or broadcast creative work" (UTS, *UTS Handbook 2012, Communication*).

Works Cited

ALTA. "Translation and Academic Promotion and Tenure." *American Literary Translators Organization*. Web. 23 May 2012.

Ateneo de Manila University, School of Humanities. "Research and Creative Work in the School of Humanities." *Ateneo de Manila University*. Web. 5 Aug. 2012.

Australian Government. *Australian Research Council. ERA 2012 Submission Guidelines.* Web. 15 Aug. 2012.

Barrett, Estelle and Barbara Bolt. P*ractice as Research: Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry*. London: Tauris, 2007. Print.

Biggs, Michael and Daniela Büchler. "Community, Values, Conventions and Actions." In *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. Eds. Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson. London: Routledge, 2011. 82-98. Print.

Biggs, Michael and Henrik Karlsson, eds. *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts.* London: Routledge, 2011. Print.

---. "Contexts." In *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts.* Eds. Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson. London: Routledge, 2011. 313-4. Print.

Chambers Concise Dictionary. Cambridge: Chambers, 1989. Print.

Elkins, James. "On Beyond Research and New Knowledge." In *Artists with PhDs: On the New Doctoral Degree in Studio Art.* New York: New Academia P, 2009. 111-133. Print.

Genette, Gerard. *Paratexts*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.

Gilham, W. *Case Study Research Methods.* London: Continuum, 2002. Print.

Hatim, Basil. *Teaching and Researching Translation.* Harlow: Longman, 2001. Print.

Holmes, James. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, 2nd ed. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2004. 180-92. Print.

---. *Translated!* Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988. Print.

Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader,* 2nd ed. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2004. 138-41. Print.

Johnson, Mark. "Embodied Knowing Through Art." *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. Eds. Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson. London: Routledge, 2011. 141-51. Print.

Kershaw, Baz. "Practice as Research through Performance." In *Practice-led Research, Research-led Practice in the Creative Arts*. Eds. Hazel Smith and Roger T. Dean. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2010. 104-25. Print.

Kjorup, Soren. "Pleading for Plurality: Artistic and Other Kinds of Research." *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts.* Eds. Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson. London: Routledge, 2011. 24-43. Print.

Leavy, Patricia. *Method Meets Art: Arts-Based Research Practice*. New York: Guildford, 2009. Print.

Lefevere, Andre. "Translation: its genealogy in the West". *Translation, History and Culture.* Ed. S. Bassnett and A. Lefevere. New York: Cassell, 1900. 14-28. Print.

---. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame.* London: Routledge, 1992a. Print.

---. *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context*. Modern Language Association of America: New York, 1992b. Print.
Macleod, Katy and Lin Holdridge. "Writing and the PhD in Fine Art." *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. Eds. Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson. London: Routledge, 2011. 353-67. Print.
Modern Language Association. "Evaluating Translations as Scholarship: Guidelines for Peer Review." *Modern Language Association*. Feb. 2011. Web. 11 Aug. 2012.
Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2012. Print.
Newmark, Peter. *Approaches to Translation.* London: Pergamon, 1981. Print.
Nida, Eugene and Charles Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation.* Leiden: Brill, 1969. Print.
Nowotny, Helga. "Foreword." In Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson, eds. *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*. London: Routledge, 2011. xvii-xxvi. Print.
O'Brien, Tim. "Keynote Address: Thirty Years After." *Thirty Years After: New Essays on Vietnam War Literature, Film, and Art*. Ed. Mark Heberle. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009. 3-9. Print.
Perteghella, Manuela and Eugenia Loffredo, eds. *Translation and Creativity: Perspectives on Creative Writing and Translation Studies*. London: Continuum, 2006. Print.
Schusky, E.L. and T.P. Culbert. *Introducing Culture.* Englewood-Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1978. Print.
Simpson, P. *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge, 1993. Print.
Shottenkirk, D. "Research, Relativism and Truth in Art." *Art & Research 1* (2006): n. pag. Web. 15 Feb. 2010.
Smith, Hazel and Roger T. Dean, eds. *Practice-led Research, Research-led Practice in the Creative Arts*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2010. Print.
Swales, John. *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. Print.
Toury, Gideon. Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995. Print.
Trinity College Dublin. "MPhil in Literary Translation—Annotated Translation." Web. 23 May 2012.
U of Technology Sydney "Doctor of Creative Arts." *Humanities and Social Sciences Handbook.* Sydney: U of Technology Sydney, 2002. 115. Print.
---. "Doctor of Creative Arts." *UTS Handbook 2012, Communication*. Web. 11 June 2012.
Venuti, Lawrence, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.
Vermeer, Hans J. "Skopos and Commission in Translational Action." In *The Translation Studies Reader.* 2nd ed. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. London: Routledge, 2004. 227-38. Print.
Williams, Jenny, and Andrew Chesterman. *The Map: A Beginner's Guide to Doing Research in Translation Studies.* Manchester: St. Jerome P, n.d. Print.
Webster's New Dictionary. Taunton: World Book Marketing, 1990. Print.
Webster's New World College Dictionary. 3rd ed. Eds. Victoria Neufeldt and David B. Guralnik. New York: Macmillan, 1996. Print.